DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 945 JC 720 119

AUTHOR	Blai, Boris, Jr.
TITLE	Values and Perceptions of a Private Junior College Faculty: Public Community College Faculties and Students.
INSTITUTION	Harcum Junior Coll., Bryn Mawr, Pa.
REPORT NO	IRR-72-13
PUB DATE	May 72
NOTE	19p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; Comparative Analysis; *Junior Colleges; Private Colleges; Student Teacher Relationship; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Role; Values
IDENTIFIERS	Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

This survey of the faculty at Harcum Junior College (Pennsylvania) gives some insight into their values, their perceptions of the college environment, and their unique role within that environment. These characteristics are compared with data collected on faculty and students at three diverse California community colleges. Some of the traits discussed are professional and "terminal" (desired life outcome) values, personal characteristics, and self-comparisons. Opinions that faculty have about goals for students, various student perceptions, and reasons for college attendance are also discussed. Conclusions reached concerning similarities between faculty of Harcum and of the three California colleges include: (1) of the three professional values ranked highest, Harcum faculty have two (honesty and responsibility) in common; (2) in terminal values, each group ranked "self-respect" and "sense of accomplishment" among the top three; and (3) the pattern of major similarities and minor differences in values is similar to results of other inquiries in this field. (RN)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 061945

Values and Perceptions of a Private Junior College Faculty; Public Community College Faculties and Students

Office of Research
IRR 72-13

JC 720 119

Sponsored By
Harcum Junior College
Bryn Mawr, Penna. 19010

Cover:- Reference Room Rotunda
Learning Resources Center

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 8 1972

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

List of Tables

Table Number		Page
1	Rank-ordering of Professional Values by Harcum and Others Faculties	2
2	Rank-ordering of "Terminal" Values By Harcum and Others Faculties	6
3	Ranked Preferences of Institutional Forms & Patterns	9
4	What Faculty Think Their Students Would Want Them To Do and Be	10
5	What Faculty Think Students Look For When They Enter A Class For The First Time	10
6	Qualities Instructors Want Their Students To Gain	10
7	What Junior College Should Help Students Acquire	11
8	Problems of Junior Colleges Ranked as 'Important' & 'Unimportant'	11
9	Faculty Opinion on Who Should Make Educational and Personnel Policy	12
10	Reasons That Junior College Teachers Think Students Attend Junior College	12
11	Self-Comparisons of Subjects With Other Junior College Teachers	13
12	Personal Characteristics Chosen By The Subjects To Describe Themselves	14
13	Changes The Subjects Feel Would Make Their College A Better Place	15

HARCUM JUNIOR COLLEGE
BRYN MAWR. PENNA. 19010

Office of Research
IRR 72-13

(III)

Values and Perceptions of a Private Junior College Faculty; Public, Community College Faculties and Students

1. "Values are important to the formulation of personality, which affects perceptions and the roles assumed by people within a given environment." Park: (1971:16) The parallel-perceptions survey which is the subject of this report examines the 'personality' of the Harcum faculty, as reflected in: (1) their collective values; (2) their collective viewpoint of the institution, and (3) their role in this environment as they "see" the Harcum world. In turn, these are contrasted with the valuations and perceptions of 238 individuals staffing three diverse Southern California community colleges, as described by Park (1971) in a very comprehensive monograph.

2. The data generated in this parallel-perceptions study which utilized a questionnaire, also furnishes a basis for describing what Park identifies as the "institutional personality" of the college. Does the college have a unique identity all its own, or is it, in the words of Park ..."a hodgepodge of ideas, values, and perceptions?" As conceptualized by Park (1971: 7, 8) ... "the institution's personality reflects the perceptions of the staff and students who make up its population. Many sources indicate that individual perception does affect the character of the institution and that there are 'formal organizational values and objectives' in opposition to 'informal organizational values and objectives'. The two combined -- in times in conflict -- make up the total institution."

3. The two instruments used in this parallel-perceptions inquiry were: (1) Rokeach's Value Survey, with the very kind permission of Dr. Milton Rokeach of the University of Western Ontario, Canada; and (2) The Staff Survey, developed by Drs. Arthur Cohen and Florence Brawer of the ERIC Junior College Clearinghouse at the University of California at Los Angeles, who graciously granted permission to reproduce selected items.

4. As in the case of Park's study, this one ..."sought distribution and frequencies (as) its only measurable elements from which to draw inferences and conclusions. An analysis of the interpretations and individual definitions given to the values and of the rationale used for the priority ranking of the values by the subjects was not among the purposes of the study." .....

"The raw data were not subjected to elaborate statistical treatment. The "value" of the descriptive evidence was considered of greater importance. The purpose of the study was not to determine "quality" or to "measure" a single item, but to seek likenesses and differences in the value patterns of the subjects and of the institutions surveyed that may or may not contribute to the creation of a particular phenomenon, namely, the junior college environment." (Park: 1971:15)

5. To ascertain the values held by Harcum staff members (51 were contacted, 39 responded with useable returns), they were asked to identify (not rank) each of the modes of conduct itemized in Table 1 which they personally value as a desired mode of what might be termed either 'social' or 'professional' conduct. Ranking their collective responses in terms of the most frequently selected being assigned rank #1; the least frequently selected, rank #18, their collective rank-order preferences are noted in Table 1.

In addition, for the values of the 3 community college faculties reported by Park, the composite rankings they assigned for their 'professional' values, (according to median scores derived from a rank-order selection; i.e. rank #1 = most important; #2 = next in importance; #3 = next; etc.) are also reported in this table. Therefore, in both instances, the relative importance of these 18 values was ascertained for these groups of educators. Also included in Table 1 are the rank-order selections of some 1304 students enrolled at these three California community colleges. These are the parenthetical numbers.

Table 1. Rank-ordering of Professional Values By Harcum and Other Faculties

Harcum N=39	Values (N=1304)	Others N=238
1	Responsible (4)	2
2.5	Honest (1)	1
2.5	Helpful (9)	8
4	Logical (16)	10
6	Capable (11)	4
6	Self-controlled (7)	9
6	Broadminded (6)	3
8.5	Cheerful (8)	15
8.5	Forgiving (12)	14
10	Intellectual (13)	11
12.5	Independent (5)	7
12.5	Imaginitive (17)	12
12.5	Loving (2)	5
12.5	Polite (15)	16
15	Ambitious (3)	13
16	Clean (10)	17
17	Courageous (14)	6
18	Obedient (18)	18

7. As the following tabulation reveals, for the entire group, the three values ranked highest are Honest, Responsible, and Broadminded; for the students it is Honest, Loving and Ambitious; for the community college faculties, Honest, Responsible and Broadminded, and for the Harcum faculty alone, it is Responsible, Honest and Helpful. Therefore, among the top-3 ranked values, Honest is selected most frequently, followed by Responsible, Broadminded, Loving, Ambitious and Helpful.

Entire Group	Students	Comm.Coll.Faculty	Harcum Faculty
Honest	Honest	Honest	(Responsible)
(Responsible)	Loving	(Responsible)	Honest
Broadminded	Ambitious	Broadminded	Helpful

Although Responsible is not among the top-3-ranked values for students, it does rank fourth. Therefore, there evidently is a cluster of two values; Honest and Responsible, which are shared by all four groupings. This clearly suggests a broad general agreement among students and faculties regarding those modes of conduct which they hold in highest esteem among a group of 18 such values.

8. For the entire group, as the following tabulation reveals, the values least esteemed are Imaginative, Polite, and Obedient. For all three groups Obedient is very-least ranked; for the students the least-three ranked are Obedient, Imaginative, and Logical; for the community colleges faculties they are Obedient, Clean and Polite; and for the Harcum faculty, Obedient, Courageous and Clean are their choices. Therefore, the 'most popular', least-valued quality is Obedient, followed by Clean and Polite, with Imaginative and Courageous being selected once each.

Entire Group	Students	Comm. Coll. Faculty	Harcum Faculty
Imaginative	(Polite)	(Polite)	Clean
(Polite)	Clean	Clean	Courageous
Obedient	Obedient	Obedient	Obedient

9. As a scanning of Table 1 reveals, there are tremendous differences (generation gap?) between the valuation perceptions of these three groups of college-oriented personnel. If we accept ..."the basic assumption that values may well provide a key to understanding the generation gap," Brawer (1971: 35), the following observations, also by Brawer (1971: 34) are most pertinent: "When we use attitudes and values as bases for comparing individuals within any given population, we find ourselves better able to understand both basic similarities and basic differences. Fundamental to such comparisons is the awareness that, just as values of one group may differ from those of another, so the values of different individuals in the same group may vary.

"To perceive people along the dimensions of belief systems, it is necessary to adopt a phenomenological point of view. In this sense, an attempt must be made to get within the framework of the individuals themselves - to look at the world from their point of view, not merely from our own. At best, this is a difficult task. It can be simplified by the use of a semi-structured, projective device such as the values scales developed by Rokeach and used in the study reported in this monograph.

"For our purposes, the examination of belief systems through an individual's own hierarchical ordering of his values presents an operationally feasible, relatively objective and straightforward approach to understanding the people who function in our schools. Actually, this examination of beliefs -- although somewhat indirect -- is nevertheless an effective way of focusing on educational structures. Although occassionally this approach has been used to look at secondary school populations and in recent years, to examine people in higher education, it has seldom been used to determine the impact of college on both students and staff. Even less frequently have such variables been used to understand the junior college in terms of its people or the differences that exist between the generations."

10. Why for example, do students place such a low valuation upon Logical as compared with the higher faculty rankings? What 'explains' the high student ranking for Ambitious, in contrast with the very low rankings assigned by the faculty samples? Why the marked dissimilarity of rankings for Independent between the Harcum faculty and the community colleges students and faculties?

11. In view of the findings reported in paragraphs 6 and 7 above, I cannot entirely share Brawer's (1971: 36) comment; "Although there seems to be no particular constellation of student values." I note that among the top-4-ranked values, both Responsible, Honest are shared by all of the groups. The data further indicates that students, and Brawer (1971: 36) goes on to comment ..."the staff's responses appear to represent the Protestant Ethic, to which many of them probably adhere. Honest, Responsible, and Capable, (to which I would add Helpful and Ambitious), all sound as if one who valued them highly were dedicated to his work and to the concept of a good day's work for value received. One might then ask why Obedient and Polite (to which we add Clean), are ranked so low, an answer to which might be found by looking at the value Independent, ranked fairly high by each group. For both staff and students, these findings are consistent with Rokeach's (1960) report of religious groups. Here the subjects all de-emphasize Clean, Obedient and Polite, and are consistent with Rokeach's (1961: 35) "non-believers who put relatively less emphasis ... on such Boy-Scout values as being clean, obedient, and polite."

12. As further reference to Table 1 will reveal, both Harcum and Other faculties place very high valuations on Responsibility and Honest as desired modes of professional conduct, and least value upon being Obedient. In respect to the other 15 behavioral characteristics, differences in rank ordering vary from a minimum difference of .5 (Imaginative = 12.5 vs 12), to a maximum of 11 (Courageous = 17 vs 6). Further analysis of this table indicates that close approximation in ranking patterns for these faculty groups is only evident among 3 of the upper 9 (or 50%) of these 18 modes of conduct, whereas closer matching is noted among the lower-ranked 9; e.g. there are 5 values in which two or less rank-order differences are evident between these two samples of Harcum and Others faculties.

13. Inspection of Table 1 will reveal that among almost half of these 18 values (44% to be precise), there is a rather close matching in valuation rankings among these faculties. It therefore follows that among a majority of the values (10, or 56%) there are sizeable differences (3 or more rank-order gaps) in the relative importance valuations placed upon this mode of conduct by the Harcum and Others groups. The most extensive difference exists for the value of Courageous (ranked 17 by Harcum vs 6 by Others), followed by Loving (ranked 12.5 by Harcum vs 5 by Others), and Cheerful (15 for Others vs 8.5 for Harcum).

14. As Park (1971) has suggested, the 'composite' or institutional personality of a junior college is a reflection of the collection of perceptions and valuations of those comprising the institution: its students and faculty. Therefore, as Park (1971: 8) points out, ..."the teacher's value-orientation and his perception of his role would have a direct bearing on the personality of a given junior college." As this parallel-perceptions survey reveals, these samples of public and private junior college faculties both place

highest valuation upon being Responsible (dependable, reliable) and Honest (sincere, truthful), among a hierarchy of 18 'social' or 'professional' modes of conduct. In the small-enrollment, close-student-attention, private junior college (Harcum), "tied" with the valuation-ranking for Honest is the value of Helpful (working for the welfare of others). Among the 3 public junior colleges, ranging in enrollment from 1300 to 2700 students, the third most important value among their faculty respondents was Broadminded (open minded).

15. Completing the upper-quartile selections (top-4 selected) for Harcum and Others, the Harcum faculty opt for Logical (consistent, rational); the Others for Capable (competant, effective). In tabular form, these top-4 rankings consist of:

Harcum	Value	Others
1	Responsible	2
2.5	Honest	1
2.5	Helpful	(8th)
4	Logical	(10th)
(6th)	Broadminded	3
(6th)	Capable	4

16. In connection with these principal valuations, Park (1971: 9) cogently notes; "There is little doubt that human values make schools very human institutions, characterized by the same attributes that distinguish human personalities. Moreover, subcultures within schools not only contribute to the total personality but can be considered idiosyncracies of the institutional personality. Robert Pace (1966: 50) describes them as 'environmental presses'."

17. Therefore, regarding such institutional personalities, one may conclude that beyond the two top-ranked values shared by both groups: (1) working for the welfare of others (Helpful), and being consistent and rational (Logical), are highly valued by the Harcum group. (In this connection it is of interest to note; Blai (1972: 1) ..."In a recent survey Harcum students rated 'Student/Teacher interaction as their most valued experience!"): and (2) Among the larger-enrollment and probably less student-individual-attention-oriented, community colleges, wherein fewer opportunities would presumably exist for sustained student/faculty interpersonal interaction, this Helpful value does not appear well-up among the higher priority valuations: (3) It is of further interest to note that the mode of conduct termed Logical (Being consistent and rational), although a relatively 'high' value for the Harcum group, drops well-down for' the Others; being valued less-prominantly than Broadminded (openminded), Capable (competant, effective), and five other more prepotent modes of conduct: (4) Among the least-valued professional modes of behavior which, incidently, are very closely shared by both groups, are those of Ambitious (hard-working, aspiring); Clean (neat, tidy), and Obedient (dutiful, respectful): and finally, (5) since the subjects of these two parallel-perceptions surveys were educators, one might reasonably pose the question - "Why are not the values 'Intellectual' (intelligent, reflective), Imaginative (daring, creative); and Logical (consistent, rational), for the Others group, ranked 'high'?" (Both of these faculties ranked these attributes in the lower ranges of their hierarchy of selections.

19. The second group of characteristics, identified as "terminal" by Rokeach, represent "desired end-states of existence" and are summarized in the following tabulation; the student rankings again being included as parenthetical figures.

Table 2. Rank-ordering of "Terminal" Values By Harcum and Other Faculties

Harcum N=39	Values	Others N=238
1	Sense of accomplishment (12)	2
2	Self-respect (6)	1
3	Inner harmony (11)	4
4	True friendship (9)	9
5	Freedom (2)	3
6	Happiness (1)	7
7.5	Family security (5)	5
7.5	Mature love (3)	8
9	World at peace (7)	12
10	Wisdom (8)	6
11	World of beauty (16)	14
12	National security (17)	17
13	Pleasure (14)	16
14	Comfortable life (4)	13
16	Equality (10)	11
16	Salvation (15)	18
16	Social recognition (18)	15
18	An exciting life (13)	10

20. As the following tabulation reveals, for the entire group, the three values ranked highest are Self-Respect, Freedom, and Sense of Accomplishment. Among the four groupings, each of these elements is selected 3 times within their top-3 rankings, with a sharp drop to only 1 time for each of the following: Happiness, Mature Love, and Inner Harmony. The only characteristic the students 'share' with the faculties among their top-3 rankings is Freedom; whereas both faculty groups rank Sense of Accomplishment and Self-Respect among their top-3 rankings.

Entire Group	Students	Com.Col.Faculty	Harcum Faculty
(Self-Respect)	Happiness	(Self-Respect)	Sense of Accom.
Freedom	Freedom	Sense of Accomplish.	(Self-Respect)
Sense of Accomplishment	Mature Love	Freedom	Inner Harmony

21. As Brawer (1971: 35) asks ..."What do the values indicate about the generation gap? In one sense the students seem more inner-oriented than the staff. Theyvalue Comfortable Life, Happiness, Mature Love, and Freedom. (Whether the last implies freedom for themselves as individuals or for the population as a whole we do not know.) Apart from their primary value of Freedom, the staff (this comment applies equally to the Harcum faculty), on the other hand, stress Self-respect and Sense of Accomplishment. Inner Harmony, important for the staff (Harcum too), is not as important for the students, possibly because they have not yet acquired an appreciation of quality."

22. In this regard, Blai (1970: 1) noted... "Much has been written in recent years regarding the so-called 'generation gap'; the values of our youth-oriented society; and our collective concern as we view the 'failures' of the older generation.

"It has been suggested that the interaction of these social forces has led to the development of a trait among young people -- identified as the 'cult of privatism'. This has been described as a generalized student withdrawal from institutions into the self. Among the major characteristics of this 'privatism' is the rejection of meaning or authority outside of the self. In a very real sense, this 'privatism' becomes self-indulgence or a relatively simple form of old-fashioned romanticism!"

23. Hadden (1969: 32) who developed a comprehensive and detailed student questionnaire of 246 items which he administered to some 2,000 college seniors from every type of campus concluded that there appear to be five major attitudes or values which reflected the collective views of these young adults. They are:

"First, today's students are indeed idealistic and socially aware, maybe more so than any previous generation.

Second, their idealism often takes the form of contempt for the older generations hypocrisy, and failure to break out of institutional restraints and to act upon stated ideals in personal life.

Third, their rejection of existing institutions, however, is much less total than the mass media tend to indicate. Students are hesitant, sometime quixotic. Depending upon their personal experience, and upon fulfillment of the privatism ethic, they affirm certain existing institutions strongly -- and see in them the prospect for creative growth.

Fourth, for all their abstract altruism, students lack a realistic sense of what their ideals imply in terms of social and public action. It is not clear, in fact, that they are fully committed to the ideals they talk about, especially when action may conflict with privatism.

Fifth, their privatism ethic is ambiguous in all its implications. While it tends to be self-centered and anti-institutional, and assumes a high level of materialistic comfort, it develops in many cases an acute sensitivity to others and a determination to conduct their own lives so as to contribute personally to their ideal of a decent society."

24. The observations of Park (1971: 18, 19, 20) regarding the terminal values rankings of the Others group are also germane to the Harcum hierarchy, for there is far greater similarity in the 'terminal' valuation-perceptions for Harcum and the Others than among the 'professional' judgments. (The average difference between them in the 'professional' array was 3.0; among the 'terminal' distributions, 2.7).

"The top-ranking four or five terminal values indicate that the subjects are rather selfishly concerned with their personal lives. The high priority given Freedom and the moderate eleventh rank given Equality (16th for Harcum) seem to emphasize the idea that personal concerns take precedence over social concerns. In fact, the first eight terminal values can be considered self-oriented. Those values in the middle or lower ranks are either esthetic or community-socially oriented, with the exception of Comfortable Life, the subjects appear to be self-contained, looking at life's accomplishment as its own end, rather than as making the world a better place .....

"As a generalization, the 238 subjects (and the 39 Harcum sample), can be described as concerned with self in terminal values, even above family ties, and with social values in the instrumental (professional) list. There is a mixture of old and new approaches to perceiving oneself and one's relation to the external world. Such traditional values as Wisdom, Family Security, True Friendship, Social Recognition, Ambitious, Obedient, Polite and Forgiving were all in the middle or low rankings.

"Several conflicting priorities emerge in both the terminal and instrumental lists. For example, how can one achieve a Sense of Accomplishment (ranked second), (for Harcum ranked first) without Social Recognition (ranked fifteenth), (for Harcum ranked sixteenth!)? Freedom and Equality, in modern political concepts are complementary, yet Freedom was ranked third and Equality eleventh (for Harcum the ranks were fifth and sixteenth). Either the interpretations given to these terms were purely personal or no thought was given to the dichotomy of ranking the two values in this way. Although being Broadminded, third on the instrumental list, implies that one is willing to forgive one's fellow man, Forgiving was ranked a low thirteenth. (For the Harcum sample this particular conflict did not exist, for their rankings were 6th and 8.5th; quite close.).....

"Besides such incongruities as Freedom being ranked third and Equality eleventh, there is the striking fact that, as teachers, the subjects seem to reject the values traditionally associated with teaching. World of Beauty, World at Peace, Equality, and National Security, are all at the bottom of the rankings -- even Wisdom ranks only sixth; (10th for the Harcum sample). The composite pattern of terminal values is not that of the 'dynamic personality' to which Gordon Allport (1937) refers in his study of personalities. Teaching appears to be merely a task or, at best, a means to an end. They do not find it an exciting world. For them teaching means something quite different from the traditional sense of carrying on the civilization.

"It is interesting to contemplate the perceptions and roles these people have of the junior college teacher. His mode of conduct does not give high priorities to Independent, Intellectual, Imaginative, Ambitious, or Forgiving. Hall and Lindsey's account of Harry Sullivan's ideas that personality is "inter-personal" and can be studied only in that context seems to be contradicted by the composite value patterns of these subjects, who seem to interact "intrapersonally," not with others."

25. Supplementing these observations, the closer matching of Harcum and Others in the terminal values area is further evidenced in the fact that with only one minor exception (World at Peace, ranked 12th by Others), both groups include the same 10 values among their top-ten rankings. Thus, in a solid majority of these "desired end-states of existence" items, there is a co-joining of values perceptions among this sample of 277 junior college educators.

26. Turning to the second major area of inquiry in this survey study, namely; "How do staff members view the junior college environment and their roles in it"; the items drawn from the Staff Survey instrument developed by ERIC Junior College Clearinghouse researchers, Drs. Arthur Cohen and Florence Brawer; are those which Park (1971: 26) indicate, ..."give direct insight into the institutional views and perceptions of the role of the junior college teacher, not those that related particularly to a study of personality."

27. As Table 3, below, reveals, many of those queried..."have a traditional approach to teaching; only a few indicate a willingness to depart from what has probably been their method since they began their teaching career. For example, textbooks or written material for supplemental reading are still the most desired instructional media. The lecture method, both formal and informal, is favored by half of the subjects, (also true for the Harcum sample); only 20 of the 238 subjects (10 of the 39 Harcum sample), would rather use the multi-media of instruction." Park (1971: 26, 27)

Table 3. Ranked Preferences Instructional Forms and Patterns

Instructional Pattern	Harcum	Other
1. Class Sessions		
Formal lecture	5	5
Informal lecture	1	2
Structured discussion	2	1
Unstructured discussion	3	3
Audio Tutorial	4	4
2. Marking (Grading)		
Pass/No credit	5	2
Pass/Fail	3	4
A, B, C, No credit	2	1
A, B, C, D, F	1	3
1 - 100%	4	6
No marks	6	5
3. Instructional Media		
Textbooks	1	1
Periodicals	2	5
Guest lectures	4	4
TV, films, tapes	3	2
Supplemental books	5	3

28. The greatest similarity in preferences among the Harcum and Others samples is evident in the area of Class Sessions (Average ranking difference = .4), followed next by Instructional Media (Average = 1.2); the greatest divergence being found in Marking preferences (Average = 1.7). The Harcum sample select, in greatest numbers, the security of the letter-grade system, whereas most of the Others sample favored some form of "pass/fail" rather than the letter-grade. (A major consideration influencing the Harcum adherence to the traditional letter-grade system is the fact that a majority of the graduates seek transfer to 4-year colleges/universities and face practical difficulties in offering Pass/Fail grades to be considered for advanced standing transfer credit.)

29. What these educators believe their students would expect of them as teachers is summarized below in Table 4, which indicates rankings in terms of frequency of item selection. What is immediately evident is the extremely close matching between the Harcum and Others groups. Except for very minor inversions, there is a remarkably close similarity in their ranking patterns. Both faculty groups share common views that the top-three items which they believe students at 2-year colleges stress include:

(1) Opportunity for individual attention
(2) Sound knowledge of subject-matter, and
(3) Interesting learning experiences.

(It would be most interesting to learn how students would rank these particular items. In their perceptions, are there shared-views or major differences in their valuations patterns?)

Table 4. What Faculty Think Their Students Would Want Them To Do And Be

Item	Harcum	Other
Know my subject matter	1	2
Be available to them for individual conference	2	1
Give them interesting lectures	3	3
Specify learning objectives for them	4	4
Teach them to think	5	5
Assign specific course readings	6	7
Assure each a good grade	8	9
Be entertaining	8	6
Be a recognized leader in the field	8	8
Provide a climate where they would enjoy working time	10	10
Change their opinions	11	11
They don't know what they want	12	12

30. In the area of 'first impressions,' what these faculties indicated they thought students look for when they enter a class for the first time, are itemized and ranked in Table 5 below. The first, second and fourth choices are identical; alll others differ. Therefore, only with respect to the importance of their own personalities and grading systems do these two faculty groups share common priorities of perceptions in these areas.

Table 5. What Faculty Think Students Look For When They Enter A Class For The First Time

Item	Harcum	Others
Instructor's personality	1	1
Instructor's grading system	2	2
Types of test given	3	6
Course reading requirements	4	4
Number of assignments	5	3
Specific learning objectives	6	7
Friends in the class	7	5

31. Those qualities instructors want their students to gain are ranked below in Table 6. Although the matching between the two faculty groups is not as extensive as in the other dimensions above-described, identical rank-order assignments are noted in the first, last, and penultimate items; and in only one instance, (An appreciation for learning) is there more than a one-rank difference between the two groups. Overall, there is a substantial degree of similarity in these hierarchies of rankings.

Table 6. Qualities Instructors Want Their Students To Gain

Item	Harcum	Others
The ability to evaluate	1	1
An appreciation for learning	2	4
A conscious awareness of self	3	2
A feeling for the people with whom they interact	4	3
A sense of social consciousness	5	5
Sensitivity to a world of beauty	6	6

32. Those skills, knowledges, and attitudes which these instructional personnel believe the junior college should help students acquire are summarized and ranked in the following tabulation.

Table 7. What Junior College Should Help Students Acquire

Item	Harcum	Others
Self-knowledge and personal identity	1	4
Knowledge and skills directly applicable to their careers	2	6
Preparation for further formal education	3	3
Knowledge of and interest in community and world problems	4	2
An understanding and mastery of some specialized body of knowledge	5	1
A broad general education	6	5

33. Scanning Table 7, it is evident that the only 'shared' ranking is in "Preparation for further formal education". In all other items there is considerable divergence in ranked-importance of these objectives. Among the Harcum faculty, priority is placed upon self and personal achievement rather than understanding and mastery of some specialized body of knowledge. In contrast, combined median rankings for the 82 Urban, 122 Suburban, and 34 Rural community, public 2-year college faculties which comprise the "Others" group place maximum emphasis upon "an understanding and mastery of some specialized body of knowledge," with moderate and low priority assigned to the Harcum high-priority items. Clearly then, there is a major difference in Harcum and Others perceptions regarding student outcomes of a 2-year college education.

34. When asked to rate the importance of various junior college problems, these groups ranked them as indicated in the table immediately below:

Table 8. Problems of Junior Colleges Ranked As "Important" or "Unimportant"

Problem	Important		Unimportant	
	Harcum	Others	Harcum	Others
Adapting instruction to Individual differences.....	1	1.5	4	4
Dealing with students who require special attention.....	2	1.5	5	5
Understanding college policies to be followed.....	3	5	3	1
Lack of time for scholarly study....	4	3	2	3
Acquiring adequate secretarial help..	5	4	1	2

35. Once again it is clearly apparent that both groups stress student-related concerns as being matters of primary concern to them; being entirely consistent in least-ranking these two items among the "unimportant" ones. Both groups evidence a high degree of response consistency in that their rankings of "Important" problems are, with one minor inversion, the exact reciprocal of their "Unimportant" rankings. Overall, there is apparent a general comparability in the problems-perceptions of these two samples.

36. In response to the question -- "who should have major responsibility for making educational and personnel policu?", the following table summarizes their views:

Table 9. Faculty Opinions on Who Should Make Educational/Personnel Policy

Group	Educational Policy		Personnel Policy	
	Harcum	Others	Harcum	Others
Faculty	1	1	3	2
Governing Board	2	3	2	3
Administration	3	2	1	1
Students	4	4	4	4

37. Very substantial numbers among both groups share the view that faculty should have the major responsibility for educational policy formulation. Equally, similar-si zed numbers opt for Administration to assume major responsibility for those pesky personnel policies; and only a tiny number (8 out of 277, or 3%) agree that students should have major responsibility in either area. With only 34, or 12%, expressing the opinion that major responsibility for personnel policy determination should belong to faculty; as Park (1971: 31) notes: "It would be safe to guess that, to the subjects, personnel matters mean the distasteful tasks of evaluating and firing teachers. It is interesting to note that the subjects feel personnel policies are somehow divorced from teaching and learning. To these teachers, personnel policy is a cut and dried organizational matter that has little effect on the educational process."

38. Faculty perceptions regarding relative importance of reasons why students attend junior colleges are cited in the ranking tabulation:

Table 10. Reasons That Junior College Teachers Think Students Attend Junior College

Reasons	Harcum	Others
To get training for a job	1	1
To meet people of the opposite sex	2	8
To get a basic general education	3	5
To enjoy the social life	4	7
To please parents	5	2
To develop talents and creative abilities	6	6
To be with friends	7	4
To learn more about people	8	10
To learn more about community and world problems	9	11
To develop moral and ethical standards	10	12
To take part in student government or activities	11	13
To apply for a student draft deferment	12	3
To take part in athletics	13	9

39. First-ranking by both groups is assigned to training for a job, and sixth-ranking to the development of talents and creative abilities. There the similarity ceases for in all other instances, there is at least a two-gap difference between assigned rankings. Since Harcum is a woman's college, understandably draft deferment ranks low,

and "to meet people of the opposite sex" ranks high. As Park (1971: 31) comments, with reference to the Other sample: "A sharp contrast is noticeable between what the teachers want the institution to provide for the students (See Tables 6 & 7), and why they think students attend junior college (See Table 10). ... None of these reasons appear to be directly concerned with learning or with what the teachers felt the college should provide for the students or with what the students should gain from attending junior college."

40. In contrast to Park's findings, the Harcum faculty respondents evidenced a high degree of consistency in regard to what they want the institution to provide for the students (See Tables 6 & 7), and why they think students attend junior college (See Table 10). Their top-4 rankings in these three tables each include reasons directly concerned with learning as well as skills knowledge/training applicable to career preparation.

41. Two items were included in this faculty values inventory which related to their self-evaluated comparisons with other junior college teachers and personal characteristics they selected to describe themselves. Their ranked responses are noted in the following two tabulations:

Table 11. Self-Comparisons of Subjects With Other Junior College Teachers

Traits	Average		Above Average		Below Av.	
	Harcum	Other	Harcum	Other	Harcum	O
Knowledge of institutional practices	1	4	8	8	2.5	1
Accepting junior college philosophy	2	3	7	7	2.5	2
Understanding junior college philosophy	3	1	6	6	2.5	3
Ability to cause student learning	4	2	5	5	-	6
Willingness to alter instruction when appropriate	5	7	4	2	-	5
Ability to communicate with students	6	6	3	3	-	4
Commitment to students	7	8	1	1	-	8
Knowledge of subject matter	8	5	2	4	2.5	7

42. Scanning Table 11, it is quite apparent that there is substantial matching in the ranking patterns of these two groups with regard to their self-evaluated comparisons with other junior college teachers. This is evidenced in the fact that both groups selected the same four traits among their top-4; both in their "Average" and "Above Average" ratings. This results, of course, in both groups selecting the same four traits among their "bottom-4."

(1) Regarding the item - "Commitment to Students," most subjects in both groups felt they were above average; only one subject selected "below average," and the rest evaluated themselves as "average."

(2) A majority of both groups ranked knowledge of subject matter among their top-4 traits, with only 4 among the 277 rating themselves as "below average."

(3) Ability to communicate with students received "Above Average" ratings from a majority of both groups, placing it among the top-4 self-evaluated traits for these samples.

(4) Willingness to alter instruction when necessary completed the top-4 "Above Average" ranked traits for both groups; a majority of both placing themselves in this category with only 5 selecting a "below average" rating.

43. It is of particular interest to note that only one member among the Harcum respondents ranked himself "Below Average" in "knowledge of institutional practices." In reference to this particular item Park (1971: 39); "Of the total responses, 50 considered themselves below average, 126 average, and 56 above average. ...One would expect the value pattern of the above average group to resemble the pattern of administrators, but this was not the case. This raises a host of questions about the administrators of these institutions. It seems that whatever pertains to the institution, philosophically or operationally, has not been made important to any of the subjects in the study."

44. "Understanding junior college philosophy" is a "below average" rating selected by one Harcum faculty member. Park (1971: 40) notes for the Others sample: "Out of 26 responses, 153 ranked themselves as average or below average. This indicates possibly a negative attitude toward the institution, or worse, indifference. To compound the problem, the two groups showed little or no significant difference in their value-ranking patterns."

45. Where only one Harcum respondent selected "below average" for "Accepting junior college philosophy," Park (1971: 39) notes: "The answers to this question are even more disturbing -- 28 subjects ranked themselves below average and 128 considered themselves no more than average. It is reasonable to expect that some would not understand all the theoretical foundations of the junior college, but it is quite another thing that some may not accept even the concept of the junior college, however it may be interpreted."

46. For both groups, the conclusions drawn by Park (1971: 40) appear pertinent: "There is no relationship between value patterns and the way the subjects ranked themselves on the various items. The only discernable fact is that, regardless of the value-ranking pattern, the junior college teachers in this study consider themselves above average in those areas dealing with subject matter, teaching and communications, but below average or average in institutional matters."

47. Turning to the second self-evaluation item in the questionnaire, it concerned itself with self-descriptive adjectives. The combined results for these 277 subjects are summarized in the following tabulations:

Table 12. Personal Characteristics Chosen By the Subject to Describe Themselves

I am generally	Harcum	Others	I am generally	Harcum	Others
Practical	1	2	Critical-minded	11.5	10
Well-organized	2.5	8.5	Introspective	11.5	13
Self-confident	2.5	5	Experimental	13.5	14
Adaptable	4	3	Creative	13.5	11
Determined	5.5	8.5	Individualistic	15.5	4
Analytical	5.5	15	Dutiful	15.5	19
Open-minded	7	1	Social	17	12
Calm	9	18	Contemplative	18	16
Happy	9	7	Conventional	19	20
Questioning	9	6	Permissive	20	17

48. With only two exceptions, both faculties rated the same characteristics among their top-10. Other than this very broad 'matching,' there is little unanimity in the rank-order selections for these trait characteristics. Whether or not these differences in self-image are real, both groups are practically-oriented, a substantial majority of each selecting "practical" most frequently and second most frequently among these 20 items. The Harcum sample then follows along by selecting most frequently work-oriented characteristics such as being well-organized; self-confident; adaptable; determined, and analytical. The Others group selected more diversified dimensions of personal characteristics, including among their top-7 rankings open-minded; individualistic; questioning and happy.

49. The final comparison tabulation, which follows, summarizes the rank-order selection of changes which the subjects feel would improve their college.

Table 13. Changes the Subjects Feel Would Make Their College A Better Place

I should like to	Harcum	Others
Have students who were inclined to study	1	3
Have a higher salary scale	2	5
Have some assurance that students were learning	3	2
Acquire more data on instructors' long-range effect on students	4	1
Have colleagues who are more committed and creative	5	4
Be granted more autonomy by the administration	6	6
Enroll only transfer students	7*	7@

* None selected this item
@ only 8 selected this item

50. The divergence in rankings between the two samples, as noted in Table 13, evidences different priorities perceptions relating to these seven change-categories. However, among their top-3 rankings, both groups selected two learning/teaching area changes: (1) Have students who were inclined to study, and (2) Have some assurance that the students were learning. Both also low-ranked the same two changes concerning limiting enrollment to transfer students and being granted more autonomy by the administration.

51. One final, open-ended item was included in the Harcum questionnaire: -- "If you would like to add anything about your replies to this questionnaire; or about Harcum; or any other views; please do so." Five did so: their comments follow:

(1) "I don't think that this is a very good questionnaire."

(2) I think that this is a time for Harcum to reevaluate its social regulations. Social restrictions and a lack of adequate social activities are contributing to a continuing decline in enrollment. The college cannot afford to continue to enforce a set of out-dated regulations.

(3) I appreciate the opportunity to voice my views and applaud Harcum for trying to improve itself.

(4) Good policy set down by administration, faculty, and students -- provides the direction for all to move. It also provides the framework or structure for action to take place. Within this structure then the faculty should be "granted more autonomy by the administration." (See Table 13)

(5) Eliminate rumor-mongering! Recognition from administration for attempts to do a good job. More opportunities for true exchange of ideas between individual faculty members and administration in working toward a common goal - the College."

52. From the responses made by these samples of 277 faculty/staff personnel and 1304 students at 2-year colleges, the following conclusions are offered:

(1) Insofar as 'ranking' of Rokeach's 'professional' values, there is a cluster of two values; Honest and Responsible, which is 'shared' among the top-3 rankings of these varied 2-year college constituencies.

(2) Among least-esteemed values, Clean and Obedient are also 'shared' by each of these samples.

(3) Clearly then, among their most-and-least-prepotent value perceptions, these three groups of 2-year college personnel share common life-style values among their desired modes of 'social' or 'professional' conduct.

(4) Turning to those values which Rokeach has termed "desired end-states of existence," there are greater differences rather than similarities between the student and faculty groups. The only 'shared' value among their top-3 rankings is Freedom; whereas both faculty groups highly esteem Self-respect and Sense of Accomplishment. As both Brawer and Hadden suggest, these younger students seem more inner-oriented, opting for the 'privatism' ethic.

(5) Park's (1971) faculty samples (with one exception:- "World at Peace") and the Harcum faculty sample, select the same 10 values among their top-10, reflecting a very substantial 'sharing' of value systems as they relate to these "end-states of existence."

(6) This pattern of "Major similarities - minor differences" is typical of the remaining areas in which these value perceptions have been compared among these samples of both public and private 2-year college faculties.

53. Park (1971: 48, 50, 51) concludes: "A disconcerting revelation of the data collected was that all the subjects regardless of the category of their perception of the institution, of the students, or of themselves, tend to have similar value-ranking patterns... Plainly stated, the subjects in this survey isolate themselves from their work; they reject the institution, of which they should be the most vital part. They hold themselves in high esteem, especially in an academic sense, yet they negate the modes of conduct that one would assume help to bring about their desired ends."

54. After considering the data generated in this parallel perceptions survey, there appears to be far less "institutional isolation" or "institutional rejection" among the Harcum sample than among the 3 public, community college faculties. Perhaps the overall pattern of environmental 'press' differs sufficiently among the public and private 2-year colleges to 'explain' the differences noted. Two other variables which may well have contributed to the differences noted would include the leadership stimulation and encouragement provided by the administrators involved, as well as the levels of professi competence and dedication among the individuals comprising the Harcum and Others samples.

Boris Blai, Jr. Ed.D.
Director of Research
May 1972

References

Allport, Gordon. "Personality, A Psychological Interpretation." New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. 1937

Blai, Boris, Jr. "Values & Attitudes of Student & Faculty-Staff" Harcum Junior College. IRR 70-12, 1970. (unpublished: mimeo)

..... "Keeping Up With Harcum." Harcum Junior College. Vol. X No. 8 1972 (unpublished: mimeo)

Brawer, Florence B. "Values and the Generation Gap: Junior College Freshmen." Monograph Series No. 11. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College American Association of Junior Colleges.

Hadden, Jeffrey H. "The Private Generation" PSYCHOLOGY, October 1969.

Pace, Robert. "Perspectives on the Student and His College." The College and The Student. (Edited by Lawrence Dennis & Joseph Kauffman) Washington, D.C. American Council on Education. 1966

Park, Young. "Junior College Faculty: Their Values and Perceptions." Monograph No. 12 ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges/American Association of Junior Colleges.

Rokeach, Milton. "The Open and Closed Mind." New York. Basic Books. 1960